



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,744	11/25/2003	Jeremy D. Peters	17359	7296

26637 7590 12/22/2004

CNH AMERICA LLC  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT  
700 STATE STREET  
RACINE, WI 53404

EXAMINER

BINDA, GREGORY JOHN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3679

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/722,744

Applicant(s)

PETERS ET AL.

Examiner

Greg Binda

Art Unit

3679

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

*Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to because they fail to adequately show the disk spring 12, sleeve 36 and shoulder 38 assembled together to form a shock damper, the alleged improvement in the claimed invention. A sectional view of the shock damper showing all of these elements in detail needs to be included with the drawings.
2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

*Specification*

3. The disclosure is objected to because both pages 10 & 12, lines 1 include the phrase "denoted by arrows B and C" but it is not possible to determine what elements and/or features are actually denoted by the arrows B and C.
4. The specification is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.71 and 1.75(d)(1) because the detailed description fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter of claims 8, 14 & 22.

*Claim Objections*

5. Claim 1 is objected to because at line 17, "greater than magnitude" should be changed to greater than the magnitude".

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In claim 1 the structure of the improvement to the prior art is undefined. Only the result of the

Art Unit: 3679

improvement is set forth and so therefore claim 1 is a **single means claim** (a claim where a means recitation (i.e., the shock damper) does not appear in combination with another recited element of means). A single means claim is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 112(1). *In re Hyatt*, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed Cir. 1983) and *Young v. United States*, 179 USPQ 801 (US CICt 1973). See also MPEP § 2164.08(a).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-4, 9, 10 & 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leonard et al, US 4,062,203 (Leonard). Figs. 1-3 shows a jaw clutch comprising a driving rotatable member (see “a standard socket or handle” in col. 2, line 61) with a first clutch plate 66 having teeth 74; a driven rotatable member (see “a load” in col. 1, line 11) with a second clutch plate 68 having teeth 75; a clutch spring 64 disposed for exerting a spring force against the first clutch plate; and a shock damper comprising a disk spring 69. Fig. 4 shows the clutch spring is yieldable to a disengagement force greater than the spring force. The clutch spring 69 is disclosed as having a spring rate (see “small compressive force” in col. 3, lines 3 & 4 and “very light” in line 36) that is several times smaller than the spring rate of the disk spring 69. Figs. 1 & 3 show that the second clutch plate 68 and the rotatable member are mounted on a sleeve 72, the

Art Unit: 3679

sleeve including a shoulder 73 extending therearound, and the disk spring 69 disposed between the second clutch plate and the shoulder.

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 5-8, 11-14 & 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leonard. Leonard shows all the limitations of the claims but does not expressly disclose the spring rate of the disk spring 69 between about 35,000 and about 38,000 pounds per inch and the spring rate of the clutch spring 64 being between about 2100 and about 2400 pounds per inch. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the disk spring rate substantially between about 35,000 and about 38,000 pounds per inch and have the clutch spring rate substantially between about 2100 and about 2400 pounds per inch, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Kulling*, 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056

Art Unit: 3679

*Conclusion*

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Dawson, Paul and *SAE Manual* each show a slip clutch like that in the preamble of the instant claims. Helmut shows slip clutches with various types of clutch springs.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Binda whose telephone number is (703) 305-2869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 am to 7:00 pm with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on (703) 308-2686. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Greg Binda  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3679